DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 204 268 SP 017 985

AUTHOR Olson, John K.
TITLE Translating Innovative Doctrines Into Practice: Appreciating the Classroom Context.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 26p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Los Angeles, CA, April, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adoption (Ideas); *Change Strategies; *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Guides; *Curriculum Problems; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Expository Writing; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Curriculum guides can have a positive effect only if they acknowledge the intentions of teachers and the context in which the curriculum will be taught. Those who write guidelines should be aware of four central questions, all of which address the communications gap between outsiders and practitioners: (1) What does it mean to say that a written guide can guide practice? Just as a travel guide decribes the surroundings, the new meaning and directions for an action should be detailed: (2) How can effective guides be written? An example of a well-intentioned but unsuccessful curriculum guide shows the uselessness of exhortation, and reveals the need for concerned background research: (3) How is the guide writer understood? The terminology and inference of words and phrases must be clear and within the context of the beliefs of the intended audience: and (4) How can we appreciate the classroom context? An approach called "constructive alternativism" can help outsiders learn the substance of classroom life and can foster a language capable of allowing communication between those inside and outside the school. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED204268

Translating Innovative Doctrines Into Practice: Appreciating the Classroom Context

John K. Olson
Faculty of Education
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. K. Olson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper presented as part of the symposium "Can written curriculum guides guide teaching?" at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Los Angeles. April 1981.

SP 017985

Introduction

One of the most important problems for curriculum is that of communication. People outside schools constantly seek to influence what those inside do and fail. (Westbury, 1973; Walker, 1980). Why do they fail? They fail, I think, because outsiders fail to understand what teachers are trying to do. As a consequence a gap exists; what one means to say, the other does not understand. This issue is at the root of the question: "Can written guides guide practice?" The answer is yes only if the guide writer pays attention to the context in which teachers work, and to the language that teachers use in that context. It is this idea I would like to pursue in this paper.

I have divided the paper into four parts, all of which address the central question and I hope serve as a framework for this symposium. My first concern is with the question: What does it mean to guide practice? Here I will use Searle's (1969) notion of a linguistic "institution" (p. 51) to suggest what the constituitive rules of guide writing as a speech act might be. I will argue that one of the rules of the institution requires that the guide writer understand what the teacher is trying to accomplish through his/her actions. It is here that consideration must be given to the context in which these acts take place.[1] The problems encountered in practice by a particular curriculum project (Olson, 1980) are used to illustrate the consequences of a failure to appreciate what teachers are trying to accomplish in their work.

The third section of the paper raises the fundamental questions of whether what Searle (1969) "normal input and output conditions" (p. 57) obtain in most efforts to write

to write curriculum guides. One of these conditions is that speaker and hearer both know how to speak the same language. Clearly both likely speak the same "language", but is there not a translation problem when proponents of innovation attempt to communicate their ideas to teachers using terms which may have little importance in the "systemic" structure of the teacher's language (Churchland,1979, p. 70). The theoretical structure of the innovators ideas may give to terms meanings which teachers may find difficult to understand. Given that innovators may theorize differently than teachers about a roughly common domain of problems, and if we accept, as I do, a holistic account of meaning, the issue of the limits of communication arise as they do whenever different theoretical systems attempt to account for similar problems. The matter of translation of innovative ideas from one theoretical system to another will lead us back to the pre-requisites of the process of advising itself, and to the question which is treated in the final section of the paper: how can we appreciate the classroom context? It is upon such an appreciation that effective guide writing must ultimately be based.

What does it mean to say that a written guide can guide practice?

The notion of a curriculum guide begs comparision with the sort of guides we go to to help us understand unfamiliar territory. The classical guide of this kind is the Baedeker's guide. How do these guides work? Consulting my 1910 Baedeker's Great Britain, I learn, for example, that "Salisbury Cathedral, a splendid example of pure Early English, enjoyed the rare advantage of

having begun and finished within a period of forty years and is remarkable for the uniformity, harmony and perspicuity of its construction." These are the sorts of statements I expect to find in a guide. The guide helps me interpret what I see around me; it offers advice on how best to spend my time and money. The things I find in a guide are what I expect to find there. The guide is written according to conventions which both the guide writer and the reader understand. Thus, in the case of my Baedeker, the way the landscape is treated is not unexpected; it conforms to the conventions of guide writing of the Baedeker tradition. Thus, the the landscape, normally perceived by most as relatively undifferentiated, is, in the Baedeker's guide, almost insanely detailed and particular. One looks to left and right almost every other second; objects of note are everywhere and are to be thoroughly savoured.

The Baedeker guide can be likened to what Walker (1980) calls: "curriculum documents ... the writings teachers and and students use" (p. 73). He notes that such documents need to be clear and specific so that those who "are supposed to be instructed by the document know exactly what they are being advised to do" (p. 73). The travel guide has to live up to the same demands, but there is more than the matter of clarity and specificity at stake here. The guide writers are relying on the reader to understand the intention of the guide writing act itself; that something special is happening. What is being offered isn't just information, or description, but something that will be of benefit. The guide writer offers advice. The guide writer relies on the reader to take what is written in this

way. The particular activities of the guide writer make sense when taken as part of the larger linguistic institution of guide writing.

To pharaphrase Searle (1969), guiding teaching involves a "variety of activities, states and raw feels, ...(these) count as part of (the activity) given other conditions and against a background of certain kinds of institutions... These institutions are systems of constituitive rules. Every institutional fact is underlain by a (system of) rule(s) of the form X counts as Y in context C" (p. 52). What counts as advice?

Searle analyses the speech act of promising to show how such an act might be successfully performed. Such an analysis allows him to isolate rules which govern how the statement is to be taken. Such rules he likens to those of games in which certain preparatory and essential conditions must obtain. Thus, in the case of chess, in order to move it must be one's turn to move , and the move must be one permitted by rules governing a particular piece. Further, one is expected not to cheat, or lose on purpose. It is the <u>preparatory</u> rules of guide writing that are of particular interest here.

Preparatory rules are those rules which give the act point; if the act is to be understood as the kind of act it is, then people expect the actor to conform to certain prior conditions. So for example, I would not advise some one to do something they are already doing, and I must have reason to believe that the person will benefit from the future act that is being advised (Searle, p. 67).

The point of these rules is that they permit us to isolate

those elements of the linguistic institution of guide writing (taken here as similar but not identical to advising) which give it its particular force; that is, which enable the hearer or reader to understand what is meant. So, in the case of advice, I would not expect to go to a guide and find that I am advised to do what I am already doing. Advice is something new. How difficult I might find the advice to understand depends on the novelty of the proposal. I would also take it that what I am being urged to do is well founded. The person who advises me presumably has reason to believe that it will be in my interest to do what is being advised. We can use the preparatory rules of advice giving to look at a particularily important piece of advice in the case of the guides to the English Schools Council Integrated Science Project (SCISP).

> There will be a partnership between teacher and pupil in learning... Teachers are often worried about the danger of imposing their attitudes on pupils. It is suggested that class discussion be based on the materials provided ...and that they should not become the basis of disagreement between pupils and the teacher. Direction will sometimes need to be given and the teacher selects the material to be discussed Handbook, p. 59, 60).

How effective is this as a piece of advice? Clearly, the writers had reason to think that teachers would not normallly think of their work as a partnership. The advice is thus well founded in this respect. But what about the other preparatory rule: the writer has some reason to believe that the teacher will benefit from the advice? It is here that one begins to worry about the adequacy of the act. One of the rules which controls the use of the

advising speech act is that the guide writer indeed has reason to offer such advice. What might count as a good reason? What do the guide writers know about how teachers conceive of partnerships in the classroom. What do they know of how teachers cope with disagreement. The act, if it is to have the force of advice, supposes that the guide writer knows something about how teachers construe what might be called "influence" in the classroom, (Olson, 1981). For the advice to be advice at all, we have to suppose that the guide writer knows something about the problems teachers have in exercising influence in the classroom.

Unless the guide writer has some idea about what the teacher is already doing, and about what the teacher intends to do, how can the writer give advice? This seems a trivial point, but it isn't. The rule requires, I would argue, that the guide writer find out about the intentions of the teacher. The guide writer isn't just talking off the top of his/her head; he/she knows something about the context in which his advice is to be taken. Returning to the example taken from the curriculum project, it became clear from talking to teachers about it that the advice offered did not speak to the problems the teachers actually faced in trying to operate the project. Ilene Harris (1981) probes in greater detail the nature of guide writing as a kind of speach act and expands upon the forms of written communication that quide writers can use to communicate their advice most effectively.

How can effective guides be written?

The problems teachers had in using the curriculum project can be traced to a failure of the guide writers to take seriously one

of the rules of advice giving: they did not find out about the life of the people they presumed to advise. Instead of advising, they exhorted, the advocated, they enjoined; quite different acts. They failed to do the research that advice giving requires. The guide writer has to do research. An appropriate agenda for research has been suggested by Fenstermacher (1978) using an intentionalist account of action. He suggests that the researcher of teaching find out more about what teachers intend by their classroom actions: what are teachers trying to accomplish by their acts? How do the belief of teachers come to be formed? What is the influence of the institution on the formation of beliefs? These are useful preliminaries for the guide writer to undertake or study. As Fenstermacher notes: "The researcher of teaching cannot do research without in some way participating in the education of teachers, nor can the teacher education transform beliefs without participating in the study of teaching" (p. 182). Guide writing calls upon the writer to be both researcher and educator; and in both roles, he/she will have to pay attention to the intentions of teachers. Why is this so?

For purposes of disciplinary knowledge, we may well invoke causes outside the teacher to account for practice, but if we wish to guide the teacher we will have to study practice from the point of view of the teacher. If we didn't, we would have no reason to think that our advice was potentially helpful, because we would not know what the teacher was trying to accomplish. If we ignore the intentions of the teacher, we have no grounds for offering advice; what we offer is only gratuitous and random. We could of course, simply tell the teacher that some action A is

good for him/her because research says it is so. If we did this we would not be guiding, but doing something else like mandating; a different sort of act entirely. And in fact many documents which we might think of as guides have the force of mandates. A guide can be written, but it can only be written effectively if the author knows something about the practices of those he/she wishes to influence. I will not reherse further the arguments of the intentionalist account of teacher behaviour and its value in curriculum theory, but refer the reader to that extensive literature (for example: Harré and Secord,1972; Argyris and Schön, 1977; Reid, 1979; Connelly and Ben-Peretz, 1980).

The writers of the guide to the curriculum project I studied simply did not pay attention to the pedagogical implications of what they were proposing. Had they, they might have hesitated to advise what they did. The guide writers were not interested in pedagogy, ironically; instead they took it as their task to instruct teachers in the nature of Gagné's (1965) hierarchy of cognitive operations, and show how the activities selected in the texts functioned in the terms used by Gagné. Advice, useful to teachers, was mostly absent. Exhortation to adopt the new practices was more common.

It is not surprising that the teachers did not use the guides; when they went for guidance, most often got a lecture. This put teachers in an untenable position. The students who took the course wrote externally set examinations, and the teachers were expected to prepare them to do well. But how to do well when it was difficult to know how to operate the project in the absence of guidance? The teachers, I found, rewrote the lectures of the

handbook into a guide they could use. Their "guide" was a translation of the theoretical language of the handbook into a familiar language of practice. In this way they "found" information which could be used to operate the project in the minimal way they did. They extracted and reshaped elements of the project plan to suit how they normally operated. Normal operation allowed them to get on with the job of preparing students for external examinations. They created a guide by giving themselves advice which made sense in their context.

An example of how teachers constructed their own guide out of the handbooks can be seen in their fabrication of a syllabus to use in preparing students for examinations. It was here that teachers sought advice from the handbook. What was the syllabus of content they were responsible for? The answer from the project team was that the project did not have a syllabus in the teachers' sense of that word; only a limited number of cognitive skills which were to be nurtured by the teacher; and to be locked in the heads of their students, and not to be found in the notebooks to be reviewed and learned for the examination.

Where the handbook writers went wrong was in not appreciating why a syllabus was important to teachers; how such an institution functioned in the classroom. Teachers pointed to the syllabus as an authoritative text to be used in disputes with pupils and outsiders on whether this or that should be taught. The syllabus they said, provided a measure of ground covered and formed a contract between teacher, pupils and examining board. SCISP had

no syllabus, but there was a list of concepts and generalizations given to illustrate one of the three unifying themes, 'building blocks'. The teachers construed this list as a 'syllabus' and proceeded to translate it into the basis of a 'syllabus' system.

One of the teachers explained how the 'syllabus' system worked:

> Quite frankly we gave them the list of concepts and patterns and we said learn this and this; this is what this means. Course finished! And this is where we got our grades from. We emphasized the main concepts...As far as I would tell there was no problem if you've got duplicated sheets of all the concepts. They had the list of concepts and I said you've got to know every one of them...you make sure you understand those!(Interview BJ,10 February 1978.)

To tell teachers that there was no syllabus was like an architect saying to a builder that there are no plans for the building, but perhaps a lecture on prestressed concrete might be of interest. Without an understanding of the pedagogical theories of teachers, in which the syllabus was an important term, the handbook writers, in their efforts to guide, failed to provide the kind of advice that would have been helpful in the circumstances. Digby Anderson (1981) treats this problem from the other side of the coin by looking at texts which teachers think are "practical", but in fact are of limited influence unless adjusted to work in the classroom.

It is worth at this point, to review where the argument has led. Guide writing is a type of speech act whose force is given by a number of constituitive rules. One of those rules, what Searle (1969) calls a preparatory rule - a rule that gives point to the act - is that the advice-giver has some reason to think

that the person will benefit from the advice. This rule, it was suggested, leads us to the idea that the advice giver needs to know something about what the person is trying to accomplish. Research by the advice-giver into the life of the advisee was seen as a precondition of effective action. A particular approach to research was suggested as being well related to the demands of the institution of advice giving. The fate of a particular curriculum project was seen to be due to the failure of the planners to consider how their plans would affect the lives of the people who would implement them, and consequently due to the failure to give effective advice. In fact, little in the way of advice as we understand it here was given. The project documents can be seen to have other kinds of force such as: exhortation; invocation; and co-option.

How is the Guide Writer to be Understood?

Guide writers have an obligation to their readers beyond familiarizing themselves with the intentions of the people they hope to guide; beyond conceiving of the practice of teachers, they have to be able to give advice in a way that others can understand it. In everyday language, there may not be a problem about advising. Advice about how to keep healthy, about how to tend one's garden may not be difficult to communicate; however, that may not be the case in communicating innovative ideas about teaching. Much of such advice is given on the basis of prescriptions drawn from research and communicated in a language of the research

field itself. This was the case in the project we have already looked at. Teachers were guided in the use of the text material in a language derived from a particular brand of cognitive psychology. Thus, for example, students were meant to engage in "problem solving" and "pattern finding"; these words had quite precise technical meanings in the theoretical language of the planners. The teachers did not understand these words that way. When asked they could give no more than their everyday meanings. Pattern finding was seeing patterns in things, like patterns in a painting; problem solving was solving problems, like starting a stalled car. What the project planners meant by these terms was not communicated; the teachers were not able to translate them into classroom relevant terms. Thus the guide writer is faced with a problem of communicating his meanings to others, and it is to this central problem that we now turn in the next part of this paper.

The problem of being understood was brought home to me in one of the interviews with a teacher involved in the curriculum project we have discussed here. When asked about the difficulties involved in operating the project, the teacher said that it had been difficult to revise. For the next ten minutes I quizzed him on the assumption that he meant that he had had trouble deciding what to change in the course when he again taught it. This isn't at all what the teacher meant. He meant that it was difficult to review with the students the material they should know for the examination; a major criticism of the project, as it turned out. What the teacher had done, in his brief complaint, is mean more

than he said. He expected me to appreciate the implications (the reverberations within his system of beliefs about teaching) of saying that revision was difficult. For the sake of brevity, and of not stating the obvious, he had telescoped his complaint, a fundamental one, into a brief sentence loaded with freight. I had to scramble to find out what the teacher meant by what he had said. I had to find out what the term "revise" meant in his theoretical system. What he meant was "Look, I don't want to complain, but in this project it is difficult to accomplish one of the most important tasks I am asked to do." If I hadn't been able to see that we were at cross purposes we would have never talked about a central issue for that teacher. His idea of course revision and mine were different. These terms have different means in our respective conceptual systems. Both were what Churchland (1979) calls "systemically" important. Guide writers run similar risks in talking to teachers and in this respect, as the research proceeded, it became clear that the project planners has not communicated very well with the teachers either.

This could be seen most clearly in the way the planners talked about problem solving; a key term in the theory of the project. Problem solving was taken to be an important intellectual skill to be developed through discussion, or, generally through what might be called "doing problem solving" (DPS). DPS was meant to promote a skill which involved the use of facts and values as a basis for either testing hypotheses or making practical decisions. The conceptual basis of the skill was derived from Gagné's (1965) Conditions of Learning - itself not a rich

source of pedagogy. All the handbooks said about problem solving was that it required partnership between pupil and teacher. What did teachers make of this mysterious partnership that was supposed to be involved in DPS? They read DPS in terms familiar to them; that is, in terms of their influence over the direction, point and manner of classroom activity. Teacher theories of influence in the classroom, as it turned out from an analysis of the clinical interviews used in the study, was an important source of terms in their language of practice. Teachers talked about: getting the facts in; hammering ideas; basic stuff; being a fount of wisdom; expert; predictable; productive; precision; putting right; arbiter. Being a partner with their students was not a term in that language. Instead,when they were expected to do problem solving, they engaged in versions of it which made sense in their terms. These versions did not conform to what the planners had meant by "partnership".

Rather than using a language whose terms are developed from a theory of mental events, teachers used a language whose terms were given meaning by their theories of classroom influence; that is, theories about authority and the nature of their efficacy(Olson, 1981). In terms of this language, they read DPS and the partnership it involved as an abdication of their authority, and a failure to teach. The language they used to describe how they saw the low influence role captures the sense of their withdrawl and illustrates, by default, their theories of influence: uninvolved; hovering; ticking off; technician; observer; referee; in the background. Doing problem solving

was translated as losing influence.

Many of the investigations of the project involved DPS. What were the teachers to do? They translated these activities in terms of their theories of influence. DPS became, variously: reviewing the facts of the section just completed; wasting time; recess; a pretense. One teacher saw what to him looked like an end of section review; so the students were told to answer the questions by going back into the text. The questions were meant to stimulate debate and the going back was absurd, but at least the activity made use of the material and the teacher remained in charge. One teacher treated DPS as a bull session; it wasn't serious work, so nothing was lost if the lesson didn't go well. Another simply let the students talk and then imposed the "correct" view.

Why did the teachers do these things? They did them to protect their influence, which they saw as being eroded by DPS. DPS didn't make any sense in classroom terms. The teachers did not understand what DPS meant in terms of authority and efficacy; the planners had failed to indicate what DPS meant in such terms and thus to guide.

What is the significance for future writers of guides of these cases? The significance is that guide writers must not only appreciate the intentions of the teachers, they need to understand the language used to talk about those intentions. The teachers were concerned to use their influence to prepare students for examinations. The way they talked about their work reflected these concerns and the theories teachers espoused were related to them. The writers of the guides to the project

recommended things which these teachers were bound to have difficulty understanding and, to the extent that they did understand, reject. The guide was written in one language; teachers spoke another.

Clearly, the guide writer must be concerned about how the terms of one language are going to be translated in another. Is it up to the teachers to translate guide language into their language? I think not; surely the onus is on the guide writer? It is he/she who wants to communicate

Take the case of DPS; at times this involved classroom discussion which is constituted by a number of rules. The planners showed they were dimly aware of these rules when they said for an activity to count as a discussion certain relationships between participants must prevail; a partnership is required. Now this particular kind of speech institution was not familiar to these teachers. They did not know how this rule might operate in the classroom. They did know that allowing pupils to talk freely in class undermined their influence. Teachers did not understand that "not dominating the class" could count as a form of influence. It was here that they could have been offered some advice about how it might be that influence and discussion were compatible, and that discussion did not involve the abdication of influence. What the guide writers did not do was translate discussion in a way that teachers could understand what was meant in their own terms. To make this translation the guide writer would have to know something about the nature of the theories about teaching that teachers have and how classroom

influence figures in those theories.

As Churchland (1979) suggests, "Any penetrating appreciation of another person's understanding must involve an appreciation of which the sentences he accepts are explanatorily and epistemologically most crucial in his particular view of reality" (p. 70). I would argue that guide writers need to understand how teachers construe their influence in the classroom if they are going to make effective translations of their ideas into a language that teachers can understand.

Churchland, in his discussion of theoretical and non-theoretical concepts, argues that this is a false distinction: "If viewed warily, the network of principles and assumptions constituitive of our common-sense conceptual framework can be seen to be as speculative and as artificial as any overtly theoretical system...In short it appears that all knowledge...is theoretical; that there is no such thing as non-theoretical understanding". (p. 2).

The import of Churchland's remarks for us here is that we do not distinguish between the theories teachers have about their practice and theories about practice based on the disciplines. Both share the same properties and for both attempts to convert the terms of one into the terms of the other takes us into problems of translation as much as in any other case of translating from one conceptual domain into another. There is reason to think that the language in which most innovative ideas is couched, at least those institutionalized as funded projects, is in need of translation into practitioner language if the

innovative ideas are to be understood.

Churchland offers advice on how this might be accomplished. He says:

"An individual's understanding of a term can be decisively specified only against the background provided by the entire interlocking network of (systemically more important) sentences he accepts. Therefore if we wish to speak of (sameness of understanding) across idiolects, we must again think in terms of corresponding modes in sufficiently parallel networks. In this way we are led to a holistic conception of both meaning and understanding" (p. 61).

This means that the person who wishes to communicate ideas to teachers is going to have to understand the network of belief that teachers hold and what particular terms mean within such networks. This is commonly known as the "Principle of Charity", and it seems to be a fundamental consideration for guide writing as an act of translation. As Searle (1969) points out, one of the pre-conditions of an illocutionary act is that the participants understand each other. The burden on the innovator is clear if he/she wishes to guide practitioners; the guides have to be written in a language teachers understand. Those of the project we have looked at here were not so written. Churchland, in his discussion of translation, suggests that the translator has to understand the important uses of terms in other people's languages and to do that their whole system of beliefs must be understood. He is talking about an outsider translating the insiders' language, and that is what I am proposing here. If the

guide writer wants to communicate his ideas to teachers, he has to find some way of translating current practices into new formulations in a way that preserves the meaning of the words used by teachers to describe the old practices. We don't need new languages, we need new formulations of the old. The guide writer must be a speaker of the practical languages of teachers and be able to express the new intentions in such a way that new meanings are possible, but with a maximum of shared meaning retained. What Churchland urges, and I think that this is important for guiding teaching, is that in the translation process some statements are more important than others. The guide writer has to know what are the important sentences in the teachers' theories, and work to preserve the meaning of these in the translation. To know what those sentences are he has to know the rationale of the overall system of beliefs.

We thus come back to where our analysis of advising as a speech act lead us. The rule that the advice be well founded leads the author of advice to find out about the lives of the people he/she plans to advise. Similarity, the rule that the participants must speak the same language leads us to the same place. By adopting a holistic conception of meaning, we are lead to the belief structure of the teacher and, accordingly, to particular kinds of preliminary work before guide writing begins. That work, as a number of people have indicated (see for example: Olson, 1977; Reid, 1978; Fenstermacher, 1978; Hills, 1981), involves finding out more about how teachers talk about the work they do and what they are trying to accomplish by their actions. Research methods to accomplish

this need to be developed.

Understanding the Classroom Context: The Possibilities of Constructive Alternativism

Two approaches to understanding of school realities can be identified based on their approach to teachers: one assumes that teacher behaviour is controlled by institutional cons and blandishments, or by more immediate classroom contextual factors. This approach seeks explanation for action by correlating measures of teacher behaviour. The aim of inquiry is to provide the means to shape the behaviour of the teacher to further some external purpose. The purposes of the teacher are ignored. On the other hand, the intentions of the teacher can be probed on the assumption that noone is the victim of his or her circumstances or biography. On this view, what teachers make of their situation - how they construe the alternatives they face - is taken to be important in understanding their actions. The aim of inquiry is to understand the reasons people have for acting as they do. Kelly (1955) called such approach to understanding human action "constructive alternativism". It is a phrase which succinctly describes the theoretical and methodological orientation of the approach to school realities I am suggesting here. The approach can help us learn about the classroom system from those who are involved in it (the substance of classroom life and the language used to describe it); and, second, it can help people outside the school communicate with those inside in planning the curriculum (a source of language for improving communication between those concerned about change).

These possibilities stem from the use of a disciplined method of eliciting and exploring the meaning of constructs teachers use to describe the practical dilemmas (alternatives) they face. Such a process can provide a better understanding of how teachers theorize about the work they do and these theories need to be researched as part of planning to write curriculum guides, amongst other things. The constructs used by teachers with reference to a universe of situations of mutual interest to them and others become elements of a "language" which both teachers and curricularists can begin to probe. In the study we have been discussing, particular deficiencies of communication were identified by the teachers. These, as we have seen, stemmed from a lack of "contextual sensitivity" (Anderson, 1979) exhibited by the project curriculum guides. The use of a constructive framework suggested here provides an example of how insiders and outsiders might approach problems of curriculum change together without assuming that the role of the teachers is to conform to external dictates, or the role of the planner to provide and insist upon general procedures. (For an extended discussion of the "constructive" approach to understanding the classroom from the teachers' point of view see Olson, 1980).

Notes

1. I wish to express my appreciation to my philosophical colleague George Hills for pointing me to some writers in his field who have helped me begin to get a grip on problems of communication in curriculum, and for the discussions we have had in bridging the spaces between his field and mine.

   The approach to the curriculum problem, at this point, I owe specifically to the work of Ilene Harris, whose penetrating analysis of communication stimulated my interest in linguistic institutions (Harris, 1979).

References

Anderson, D.C. The formal basis for a contextually sensitive classroom agenda. Instructional Science, 8, 1977, 43-65.

_____ Educational El Dorado: The claim to have produced a practical curricular text. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Los Angeles. April, 1981.

Argyris and Schön D. Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Churchland, P.M. Scientific Realism and the Plasticity of Mind. Cambridge: University Press, 1979.

Connelly, F.M. and Ben-Peretz, M. Teacher's roles in the using and doing of research and curriculum development. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 12, 1980, 95-107.

Fenstermacher, G.D. A philosophical consideration of recent research on teacher effectiveness. Review of Research in Education, 6, 1978, 157-185.

Gagné, R.M. The Conditions of Learning. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Harré, R. and Secord, P.F. The Explanation of Social Behaviour. Oxford: Blackwell, 1972.

Harris, I.B. Effective communication for guiding practitioners: conceptual and practical perspectives. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Chicago, 1979.

_____ Effective communication for guiding practitioners: theoretical and practical perspectives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Los Angeles. April 1981.

Hills, G. Through a Glass Darkly: A Naturalistic Study of Students' Understanding of Mathematical Word Problems. Instructional Science, (forthcoming, 1981)

Olson, J.K. Teacher education and curriculum change: re-examining the relationship. Curriculum Inquiry, 1, 1977, 61-66.

_____ Innovative doctrine and practical dilemmas: a case study of curriculum translation. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Birmingham, England. 1980; (See also Teacher Constructs and curriculum change. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 12, 1980, 1-11.)

_____ Teacher influence in the classroom: a context for understanding curriculum translation. Instructional Science, 1981, in press.

Reid, W.A. Thinking About the Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

_____ Schools, teachers, and curriculum change: the moral dimensions of theory-building. Educational Theory, 29, 1980, 325-335.

Searle, J.R. Speech Acts. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.

Walker, D. A barn-storming tour of writing on Curriculum. in Foshay, A.W. (Ed.) Considered Action for Curriculum Improvement. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.

Westbury, I. Conventional classrooms, "Open" classrooms and the technology of teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 5, 99-121.